



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

A NEW WORK ON PAUL'S EPISTLES.

THE predominant aim of this volume of popular introduction¹ is "to deal with the epistles in the historical spirit" (p. vi). The author sketches the occasion and object of each epistle, summarizes the evidence on any question in debate, and then proceeds to give a spirited and readable paraphrase of its contents, which is sure to be of use to preachers as well as to other intelligent readers of the New Testament. Mr. Shaw has not added another to the list of uninspiring volumes written on an inspired literature. He has not captured, indeed, any new aspect of his subject; but in this conscientious summary he shows something of his master Godet's religious penetration, and Paulinism is always more to him than a far-off happy thing or a mere historical phase of primitive Christianity. Thus Philemon suggests a survey of slavery, ancient and modern (pp. 305 f.), Kipling's "Recessional" is printed in full (pp. 262, 263), and Anglican episcopacy comes up for discussion in connection with Ephesians (pp. 391 f.). It would be interesting to defend and expound the paradox that the true preacher must be a critic, and the true critic a preacher; and Mr. Shaw's book might serve as a fair text for such a discussion. But meantime it is enough to say that he does not touch the relation of Paulinism to Jesus and to the popular Christianity of the age, its Hellenic and rabbinic coefficients, its inner development in the apostle's mind, its relative and transient factors, or indeed the vital problems of its evolution. His treatment approximates to that of Conybeare and Howson, rather than to Sabatier's; he stands nearer to Farrar than to Pfleiderer. Without being ungrateful for this useful contribution, one may be permitted to express the hope that English scholars will turn their attention for the next few years to problems of Paulinism which lie beyond the purview of commentaries and such general introductions. An essay in English, *e. g.*, is badly wanted on the relation of Paul to Jesus, something as critical and competent as Feine's recent monograph, but better balanced. Then, an inquiry into the relation between Paul and Philo

¹ *The Pauline Epistles: Introductory and Expository Studies.* By R. D. SHAW, B.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark; New York: imported by Scribner, 1903. Price, \$3.50, *net*.

(*e. g.*, in 1 Corinthians) would not be unwelcome. And there is room for a monograph, not merely on Paul's eschatology and on his idea of the Spirit, but on his ethnic environment; despite Wendland's *caveat*, the lines pointed out by Heinrici and Hollmann will surely lead to some fruitful results, if sensibly pursued. Finally, apropos of Ephesians in particular, the relation of Paulinism to the fourth gospel still awaits an adequate discussion in our language. For the advent of any of these *laetabitur deserta et inuia, et exultabit solitudo*.

Turning to the introductory and critical matter of the book, we find its pages still occupied with the landscape rather than with the geology of the epistles. Mr. Shaw practically takes the letters as they lie in our canonical text, rearranging them, of course, in what he considers (and considers rightly, I think) to be their chronological order, but never going beneath the surface to admit any process of editing or compilation prior to their reception into the canon. The spirit in which this discussion is carried on, it must be admitted, is candid and fair. The writer's habit of sketching both sides of a controverted point (*e. g.*, the South Galatian theory, pp. 89 f.) and refraining from dogmatism, reminds one of the abbé Jacquier, the most recent Roman Catholic writer on New Testament introduction, and such open-mindedness is all to the good. It is not stimulating, but it is certainly attractive. Benjamin Franklin somewhere observes that the only people who fall into the disagreeable habit of disputing about religion are "lawyers, university men, and generally men of all sorts who have been bred at Edinburgh." Mr. Shaw belongs to both of the latter classes. But he is not caught in the sweep of Franklin's curious net, as the present writer in particular is bound and happy to admit. All the same, one cannot but feel that this book, like several others of its class, would have been more satisfactory if it had been based on a method involving more reaction of the modern mind upon the material presented to it by an ancient literature. And this leads one to say how greatly it is to be desired that some scholar would pull aside the boughs and let us look into the tangled wood of early Christian literature, to see how the epistles, *e. g.*, rooted themselves each in its respective soil, and how they were multiplied by means of copies, as well as pruned or grafted. All this growth and circulation, this relation between organization and travel and correspondence, is of real significance to the criticism of the New Testament; it underlies most of the problems of structure and even authenticity raised with regard to the Pauline letters. Paul, we say, wrote 1 Corinthians from Ephesus about

the year 53 A. D. How many problems are suggested by that simple sentence! How difficult it is to fill up the words with a historical content adequate to the literary facts of the situation! When Paul dictated the letter—doubtless during several days or even weeks—had he anything before him but the letter of the Corinthians to himself? Had he, *e. g.*, in composing chapter 15, any written notes, as A. Seeberg² has conjectured for vss. 3-5? Did he keep any copy of this or any other of his letters (dictated perhaps to two or more amanuenses at once)—a point of great importance in connection with 2 Thessalonians? When the voluntary *tabellarii* brought it to Corinth, were copies sent out to the other churches in the district (1 Cor. 1:1), while the original was retained in the church archives? Was it or any other of Paul's epistles designed for a wider audience, like Seneca's letters to Lucilius? Questions of this kind start up, so soon as one endeavors to get behind the canonical text of the epistles. And, apart from the possibility of more or less serious interpolations in the course of copying and circulation, the collection of the epistles into a Pauline canon or into the New Testament canon itself must have exposed them to the possibility of some editorial handling. The textual phenomena of Romans and Ephesians alone are enough to warn us that something of the kind occurred in these epistles. It is almost as uncritical to suppose that Paul sent Romans, exactly as we now possess it, from Cenchreæ to Rome, as to imagine that it was wholly composed by some writer of homiletic fiction in the second century. Internal evidence detaches 16:1-20 (23) at least as a note to Ephesus (though Mr. Shaw, pp. 200-207, enters his *non placet*). And for the rest of the letter recourse must be had to some hypothesis, either of different editions sent out by Paul, or of Pauline material clustering around an epistle to the Romans to which it did not originally belong. For, apart from the doxology and possibly a sentence or two here and there, I do not see that any case has yet been made out against the view that all the contents of Romans came from the lips of the apostle. The problem here is one of compilation and structure rather than of authenticity. Similarly with 2 Corinthians,³ Mr. Shaw admits that the case for regarding 10-13:10 as, in whole or in part, the intermediate letter, "is plausible, and that the case for it tends to grow stronger rather than weaker" (p. 156). If so, this fragment must have been put in the wake of the larger (chronologically, the later) epistle, by editors

² *Der Katechismus des Urchristenthums*, 1903, pp. 45 f.

³ See, most recently, J. H. KENNEDY in *Hermathena*, 1903, pp. 340-67.

who knew both had been addressed to the Corinthian church, but were ignorant of the particular local circumstances of either. Some such hypothesis seems necessary to meet the entire facts of the case; nor is it unique.⁴ It is interesting, but no more than interesting, to buttress (with Cornely, I think) the canonical form of 2 Corinthians by adducing the *De Corona* of Demosthenes, in which a calm and moderate opening is succeeded by a finale of vehement personal polemic. The case of Ephesians is rather different, no doubt, from either of those which have been mentioned. Here we have a twofold problem, of authenticity and of destination, and the latter is really independent of the former. Ladeuze's conjecture of *κατ' Ἱπιν* for *καὶ πύργοις*⁵ seems little better than a *jeu d'esprit*, though the watershed of the Iris in Bithynia would certainly give a situation for Ephesians close to that of 1 Peter, with which the epistle has indubitable internal affinities. But, in any case, the textual state of Eph. 1:1 indicates some accidental or deliberate change, occasioned, probably, by the subsequent ecclesiastical employment of the epistle. On the general question of such alterations in the New Testament writings previous to the archetypes of our extant manuscripts, only three remarks need to be made by way of a general proviso. (1) Addition was more probable than omission. Any fragments of tradition would be reverently incorporated or tacked on to other works. It is unlikely that much of importance was lost, though Col. 4:16 may denote an accidental instance of this, just as a parallel to some deliberate omissions may be found in the LXX version of Proverbs, which deliberately omits certain headings of post-Solomonic tendency. (2) The good faith and tact of the church prevented any serious alteration of the sense, and detected any attempt in this direction, as is plain from the controversy with Marcion.⁶ (3) As Loisy emphasizes,⁷ no accidental alterations which can be traced in our texts introduce any doctrinal error or any belief foreign to the general trend of revelation. Besides, in Paul's letters there is but a handful of subordinate passages which can be reasonably treated as possible interpolations or marginal comments. It will always remain a question whether these were due (1) to the author's personal revision (as in the case of similar passages, *e. g.*, in the *Persae* of Æschylus, the satires of Juvenal, the *Æneid* of Vergil, and the poems of Gower); or (2) to copyists, *librarii ab epistolis*; or finally (3) to later editors of the

⁴ Cf. R. H. CHARLES, *Enoch*, p. viii. ⁵ *Revue biblique*, 1902, p. 573.

⁶ See also EUSEBIUS, *H. E.*, xxiii, 12, and JOSEPHUS, *Antiquities*, XX, xi, 2.

⁷ *Autour d'un petit livre*, p. 29.

volume, as in the case of the Old Testament in general or a book like Marco Polo's *Travels*. Diodorus Siculus mentions the booksellers as responsible for unauthorized additions to an author's text; but this possibility scarcely comes under the purview of a critic of the New Testament epistles. As for the later threat in Rev. 22:18, 19, it may be pointed out that this passage, like some others,⁸ follows the precedent set by former Jewish writings;⁹ like the threat of Irenæus to wilful or careless copyists,¹⁰ it is directed against those deliberate mutilations of a document which were due to doctrinal bias.

On all this (pp. 477 f.) Mr. Shaw's standpoint is conservative, open-minded but conservative, as indeed upon the structure of Romans, the date of Galatians, and the authenticity of 2 Thessalonians—the three questions most agitated at present in the special field of Pauline introduction. Some students, for example, will desiderate a graver attention to the question of the authenticity of 2 Thessalonians than is betrayed either here (p. 38) or indeed in the latest and rather dull edition of these epistles by Wohlenberg in Zahn's *Commentary*. The trouble in the air at present relates not so much to the apocalyptic section as to the literary relationship with 1 Thessalonians. The strength of Wrede's subtle and vigorous essay¹¹ really lies in the argument that the literary phenomena are incompatible with the Pauline authorship, and that the epistle must have been written by a later Christian (ca. 100 A. D.) who had 1 Thessalonians before him. A parallel instance (according to some) would be the composition of Ephesians upon the basis of Colossians. But, as I have already urged, such discussions really must be decided upon a larger scale than that of the particular epistles under review; the whole field of early Christian literature, with the normal¹² conditions of composition and circulation, need first to be surveyed, and the materials for this are as yet scanty as well as scattered. Harnack's excursus in his *Ausbreitung* (pp. 268 f.), Dr. Rendel Harris's suggestive articles on Paul as a writer of letters, and some of Professor Ramsay's studies, throw some light on the problem in a sporadic fashion, and there is a partial parallel in the two treatises of Philo on the Jewish persecution in Alexandria, both of which contain frequent coincidences of expression and ideas. Yet the *In Flaccum* and *Legatio ad Caium*, as Schürer himself admits, were probably written independently at different times; any direct

⁸ *Barnabas*, xix, 11. ⁹ E. g., *Enoch*, civ, 10 f., and *Ep. Arist.* (311).

¹⁰ EUSEBIUS, *H. E.*, v, 20. ¹¹ In *Texte und Untersuchungen*, for 1903.

¹² Cf. Col. 4:16 with *Apoc. Bar.*, 86.

literary dependence is not probable. There is always the possibility, of course, that some genuine Pauline epistle was worked up by a later hand, or interpolated, like the fourth-century *Dialogus de recta fide*, twenty or thirty years after it was composed. The structure of the pastoral epistles helps to render a hypothesis of this kind not unintelligible, and it might be applied to 2 Thessalonians, though I cannot understand how a critic like Pfeiderer¹³ hopes to solve the problems of Colossians by means of it, when he accepts *in toto* (except the minor interpolations in 1:1, 2:6 f.) an epistle like Philippians (pp. 176 f.), which might more plausibly (at 3:1 f.) suggest some theory of compilation.

Mr. Shaw seems right, upon the whole, in adhering (p. 99) to the position of Galatians immediately before 1 Corinthians. Of the two currents of critical opinion which would drift the epistle either earlier or later, the latter theory needs little notice. Pfeiderer's recent support¹⁴ is of little moment, and Clemen has now abandoned his peculiar theory in favor of an earlier date, as will probably be stated in detail by him in his forthcoming life of Paul. But if Galatians can hardly be moved on to the neighborhood of Romans, a better case can be made out for it as the first of the Pauline epistles. Corinth, as well as Antioch, may have been the place of its composition, and though I still think Ephesus most satisfactorily meets the varied requirements of the situation presupposed in the epistle, it must be allowed that the fresh reading of the history recently offered by Weber (and supported by Rohr,¹⁵ Belser, and others) suggests several exegetical considerations which compel careful notice. For any date and place the argument must, in the nature of the case, be cumulative; the data are mostly to be drawn from a comparative criticism of the Thessalonian epistles and Galatians itself, while a great deal depends on the view taken of Acts, chapter 15, and its historicity. On the latter question I hardly think Weber and his allies move with sufficient critical detachment. Apart from this, however, the early date of Galatians is certainly becoming more attractive and plausible. Wohlenberg (pp. 8 f.), I observe, accepts it; but he does nothing to remove the difficulty of understanding how the development among the Galatian Christians could ripen within so brief a period. Meantime on this, as on the question of the date of 2 Thessalonians, I should prefer to maintain an attitude of that *thätige Skepsis* which Huxley advocated with regard to Darwinism at the outset.

¹³ *Urchristentum*, Vol. I, pp. 190, 191.

¹⁴ *Op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 135-38. ¹⁵ *Allgemeine Litteratur-Blatt*, 1901, pp. 226 f.

Lack of space prevents me from saying anything about Mr. Shaw's good section (pp. 266 f.) on Ephesians, but I may add a sentence upon his candid, but unconvincing, defense (pp. 425 f.) of the pastoral epistles as directly Pauline. He has the merit of recognizing that there is really a problem here. But it is surely begging the question to declare that the "rather long and uncommon preamble" to Titus is "such as only the apostle himself would have ventured upon" (p. 430), and one must again protest firmly against the assumption (p. 432) that the pastorals are strictly private and personal letters. The two real desiderata of historical criticism upon the pastorals at this time of day are (a) a positive reconstruction of their origin and function in the sub-Pauline age, and (b) a recognition, together with a reconstruction, combining self-restraint with penetration, of the indubitably authentic material which the author has incorporated in these writings. Along these lines I have already attempted to work in my article in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, Vol. IV, cols. 5079-96, where most of Mr. Shaw's objections are answered by anticipation. I ought, however, to have alluded more explicitly in that article to P. Ewald's transposition of 1 Tim. 1:12-17 to a place between 1:2 and 1:3, and of 3:14-4:10 to a place following 6:2 (to which we might adduce a partial parallel from the pseudo-Philonic *De incorruptibilitate mundi*), though this theory of his still seems less valuable than some of the points which he makes against the mosaic work of analysts like Hesse and Knoke. Little importance attaches, I should imagine, to the occasional coincidences of language between the pastorals and Plutarch, which Albani has adduced in his interesting study.¹⁶ The linguistic argument against the Pauline authorship rests rather on "the change in the use of particles, and the comparative rarity of the definite article, along with the startling divergence in vocabulary"¹⁷—the first being a vital criterion of style in matters of this kind. And the evidence on this line is too minute and extensive to be explained by any hypothesis of different amanuenses. The difference between the pastorals and the authentic Pauline letters, either in language or in ideas, is too marked for any theory that refuses to go beyond the development of Paul's own genius and the limits of the seventh decade of the first century. Heinrici,¹⁸ von Dobschütz,¹⁹ Dr. A. Seeberg,²⁰ and Maurice Goguel²¹

¹⁶ In HILGENFELD'S *Zeitschrift*, 1902, pp. 40-58.

¹⁷ *Church Quarterly Review*, 1903, 428, 429. ¹⁹ *Urchristliche Gemeinden*, 1903.

¹⁸ *Urchristenthum*, 1902, p. 100.

²⁰ *Op. cit.*, pp. 16 f., 22, 37, 172 f.

²¹ *La notion johannique de l'esprit*, 1902, pp. 68 f.

are far from being radical, yet they are only the most recent among biblical theologians who find themselves driven from different sides to this position.

Finally, one finds oneself in substantial agreement with the results rather than with the methods of Mr. Shaw's good-humored discussion (pp. 63-84) of the Dutch school. The recent prominence of this criticism has given it quite a fictitious importance, but if these cloud-compellers, or rather children of the mist, are worth direct notice, the campaign will require to proceed from some ampler and more scientific base of operations than that afforded in the main by an acquaintance with van Manen's English lucubrations and some English discussion of the same topic. Otherwise, Mr. Shaw's reading has been wide and fairly thorough. But it is not hypercritical, I trust, to regret the absence of any allusion to so satisfying a book as Haupt's edition of the prison epistles (in Meyer), or to Principal Drummond's scrappy but suggestive little volume in the "International Handbooks" series. And, in pointing his moral or adorning his tale at several points, Mr. Shaw might have drawn upon Martineau's vivid pages instead of upon — well, some lesser writers who are very much in evidence!

DUNDONALD, SCOTLAND.

JAMES MOFFATT.

JUDAISM IN THE DAYS OF JESUS.

IT has become customary to designate that period of the religion of Israel which is bounded at the one end by the Maccabean uprising and at the other by the disastrous struggle with Rome which crushed out Jewish national life in Palestine as "Late Judaism"—*Spätjudentum*. "Judaism," in a historical sense, is a term applicable only to the post-exilic phase of the religion of Israel; perhaps it may be said to begin with the act of 621. In contrast with the pre-exilic phase or Yahwism, which was a national religion, that is to say, the religion of a nation enjoying political life, Judaism may be characterized as the religion of a community developing into a church. While "Early" or pre-Maccabean Judaism is essentially concerned with the life of the small Jewish community shut in by the walls of Jerusalem, and playing the part of a mere onlooker while round about nations rage and kingdoms are moved, the later period displays volume, expansiveness, aggressiveness, and organization which all go toward the making of a church. Of the literature in which the spiritual movements of Late Judaism are recorded the single blank page between the Old Testament and the New in our English